

TAB

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Houston

STATSPEC

[REDACTED]

Also attached are two articles from the New York Times concerning this same article.

I am attempting to obtain for you the original article as it appeared in Problems of Philosophy.

25X1A

*Called &  
told him  
I was this  
is full text*

[REDACTED]

25 June 1969  
(DATE)

FORM NO. 101 REPLACES FORM 10-101  
1 AUG 54 WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

MIL. 5 Jun 69

A 4

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

## KAPITSA HITS ISOLATION OF SOCIALIST IDEOLOGY

[Editorial report--L] Moscow VOPROSI FILOSOFII No 5, signed to the press on 14 May 1969, carries on pages 146-152 a report by M.P. Gaponchka on a discussion in the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium on the tasks and prospects of the work of the journal VOPROSI FILOSOFII. Following is text of the report on the speech by Academician P.L. Kapitza: Speaking first in the debate, Academician P.L. Kapitza said that he had listened to I.T. Freloy's report on the prospects of the work of the journal VOPROSI FILOSOFII with interest since he had raised the question of further developing the world outlook which forms the basis of building our socialist society. I believe that we in the Academy of Sciences underestimate the significance of these philosophical questions in our era.

Undoubtedly, the future historian will view our century as a struggle between the capitalist and socialist systems of social organization. This struggle is proceeding in the economic, political, and ideological spheres. Our state's development in the half-century after the October Revolution has shown that the socialist system of building society is fully viable. Comparing it with the most developed capitalist system--the United States--it is possible to assert completely objectively that both countries have now attained an approximately identical level in material and cultural development, national education, scientific development, and in defense capability. The only sphere in which we lag behind is that of industrial-technical development; this is basically caused by the fact that our labor productivity has not yet reached the U.S. level.

Thus, the question increasingly amounts to a struggle between the two ideological principles on which these systems develop. Philosophy defines the ideological principles on which man's interrelationship with society is based. As is known, the basis of capitalist ideology lies in the desire of the individual for material prosperity. The basis of socialist ideology is the development of society as a whole, and the all-around development of the individual is an essential condition for this. Accordingly, in a socialist society the creative and esthetic qualities of the individual are valued most highly, and society strives to develop them. These contradictions in the attitude toward the individual in the two structures also form the basis of the ideological struggle between the two systems; today that social system is most progressive in which man's spiritual qualities are fully developed because such is the basis for man's happiest existence.

It is well known that in recent years a mass revolutionary movement has been growing in capitalist countries, particularly among young people. This movement embraces all of the most developed capitalist countries, it is growing, and its leaders are the student body. The forces giving rise to this movement are as yet not fully understood, but it has already been established that the movement has not been caused by dissatisfaction with personal material conditions in society and that it is directed toward changing ideological conditions under which man is forced to live in capitalist society. Thus, without any external influence, progressive public opinion in capitalist countries is itself spontaneously raising the question of examining the ideology on which capitalist society is based.

What direction is this examination taking? Who will create the program of reconstruction that the progressive part of society will accept, a program that will correctly lead it toward human progress? Obviously, this will be resolved in the process of ideological struggle between different world outlooks. This struggle has already started and is being developed rapidly.

Should we engage openly in this struggle? And if we do, what should be our rule? There is no doubt that the ideals and principles that form the basis for building a communist society, as given by Marx, are the only ones that can direct this struggle in the right direction. This is now being recognized by all progressive mankind.

The search is now on for specific ways to develop this revolutionary movement most effectively. This search is being made in a process of struggle between the new-style ideologists like Marcuse, Trotskiyites and others have joined the struggle.

It must be acknowledged that our ideologists are now isolated from this revolutionary process and have virtually no influence.

III. 5 Jun 69

A 6

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

This is not normal; it contradicts the fact that the successful existence of our socialist society cannot alone, as an example, cannot of itself influence this revolutionary movement.

How may we most effectively involve ourselves in the revolutionary processes taking place in capitalist society? We must now raise the level of our social sciences, lest we fall behind the development of progressive thought and so that we may study the after-effects of the scientific and technological revolution taking place in the world. We in the Academy of Sciences must therefore, have a high regard for the aspiration of the VOPROSI FILOSOFII editorial board to promote the development of philosophy, one of whose main purposes is to exert an influence on the development of social thought now taking place in the revolutionary movement in capitalist countries.

However, to exert this influence we must engage more actively in the ideological struggle now taking place in capitalist countries. Our philosophers will have to engage in this struggle on an equal basis like our sportsmen. It must be stated that our ideologists will lose the privilege they have in our country, where they do not encounter contrary views. This will not be the case in the forthcoming struggle, where everything will be done according to the "Hamburg reckoning" ["Gamburgskiy schet"]. Therefore, I propose that the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium support the program advanced by the VOPROSI FILOSOFII editorial board since it sets the journal the task of increasing its international influence; and that the Academy of Science Presidium devote more time to examining philosophical questions concerning the ideological principles of socialist society. At present this subject is virtually absent from our scientific reports in the Presidium. This must be changed.

# Eastern Europe

NEW YORK TIMES  
28 May 1969

## Outspoken Physicist

Pyotr Leonidovich Kapitsa

By THEODORE SHACAD

IN October, 1941, as the Nazi juggernaut was driving toward Moscow, a tweedy, pipe-smoking man with a puckish smile addressed a meeting of scientists in the hard-pressed Soviet capital.

The speaker, Pyotr Leonidovich Kapitsa, exhorted his colleagues to devote their talents to winning the war and suggested that atomic energy as a highly explosive force might be useful in modern warfare. He concluded his talk with an appeal for cooperation between Soviet and foreign men of science.

Dr. Kapitsa's concern with the military potentialities of the atom and his interest in East-West cooperation are two keynotes that have dominated much of the career of this plain-spoken Soviet physicist who rarely avoids matters of public controversy.

Almost alone in the last few years, he has assailed efforts to declare scientific theories true or false on the basis of Marxist dialectics, has urged the periodic weeding out of unproductive research workers, has joined in a public warning against the full rehabilitation of Stalin and has defended abstract art.

Last February, at a meeting of the presidium of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Dr. Kapitsa suggested that Soviet ideology was behind the times and was virtually without influence in the outside world.

The speech was published yesterday in the Soviet Union.

If Dr. Kapitsa has been highly conscious of the Soviet Union's role in the world, particularly in science and technology, it is probably in large part a result of his 13-year residence in Britain before World War II.

The son of a Czarist general, young Kapitsa went to England in 1921 at the age of 27 to study at Cambridge University under Lord Rutherford, one of the pioneers of atomic physics, who was then attracting promising scientists the world over. At Cambridge, the Russian turned out to be a natural research man and quickly won honors through his work in magnetism and low-temperature physics. He became assistant director of magnetic research at Rutherford's Cavendish Laboratory

and was named a fellow of the university's Trinity College.

Among his colleagues at the time was the late Sir John Cockcroft, who later became director of Britain's Atomic Energy Research Establishment at Harwell.

In 1930, Dr. Kapitsa was elected a fellow of the Royal Society, the first foreigner in 200 years to be so honored, and a corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. The Royal Society built a special laboratory for the Russian's research on techniques to liquefy hydrogen and helium.

For several years, Dr. Kapitsa had been returning each year to Moscow to visit his aging father. Then, in October, 1934, he went to Moscow to do more and did not return. Stalin himself is said to have ordered the physicist's visa canceled and to have insisted that he work in the Soviet Union.

At an indictment, Stalin bought some of the British laboratory equipment for Dr. Kapitsa and made him head of the Institute of Physical Problems in Moscow.

Although Dr. Kapitsa, at the war time meeting, was one of the first Russians to suggest military applications of atomic energy, he did not take an active part in the development of nuclear weapons.

Some reports have it that he refused to turn his talents to bomb development; others maintain that he disagreed with other scientists on technical matters. At any rate he was dismissed from his institute in 1946 and for some time was said to be under house arrest.

After Stalin's death, Dr. Kapitsa was restored to good favor and, in 1955, again became head of the Institute of Physical Problems. Although not active in nuclear research, he played the role of elder statesman, committee member and adviser in atomic physics, a role for which he was fitted by his broad interests and forceful personality.

Dr. Kapitsa's first wife and child died in a famine in 1919 while he was a lecturer at the Polytechnic Institute of Petrograd, now Leningrad. In England, he was married in 1926 to Anna Krylova, the daughter of an émigré. One of their two children, Andrei, is a glaciologist and head of the School of Geography at Moscow University.

lengthy excerpts of what was said at the meeting.

### Battle of 2 Systems

Dr. Kapitsa said that future historians would judge this century as "a battle between two systems of organized society—the capitalist way and the socialist way."

He said it was being waged in the economic, political and ideological fields.

Comparing the Soviet Union with the United States, he said that "one can state with full objectivity that in material and cultural development, in education, in science and defense capacity, both countries have reached about the same level."

"We only lag behind in the field of technological development and, because of this, our labor productivity has not reached the level of the United States."

He said that the main fight had become more and more ideological, and here, he said, the capitalist countries are faced with a "growing revolutionary movement, particularly among the youth."

"The forces causing this movement are still not fully understood," he said, "but it can be stated that it is not caused by poor living conditions. It is directed toward changing the ideological circumstances in which man lives in capitalist society."

### Ideology Re-Examined

He said that public opinion in capitalist countries was re-examining capitalist ideology and was looking for possible substitutes.

Dr. Kapitsa said various ideologies were competing to win out, and he mentioned followers of the philosopher Herbert Marcuse and Trotskyites, both of which have been condemned in Soviet journals.

He said that Soviet ideologists must take an active part because the Soviet example inevitably helped influence revolutionary movements.

Up to now, Soviet theorists have tended to remain detached from Western student movements, charging that they were overly romantic, anarchic and permeated often with Maoist and Trotskyite thoughts.

Since last April, there has been a determined drive in the Soviet Union to improve ideological work in the country. In most cases this has meant efforts by party conservatives to hold the line against different views and a hostility to Western efforts for more cultural contacts.

Dr. Kapitsa spoke at the end of February at a special meeting of the presidium of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, which was called to discuss the need for broadening the scope of the academy's philosophy.

Dr. Kapitsa's first wife and child died in a famine in 1919 while he was a lecturer at the Polytechnic Institute of Petrograd, now Leningrad.

In England, he was married in 1926 to Anna Krylova, the daughter of an émigré. One of their two children, Andrei, is a glaciologist and head of the School of Geography at Moscow University.

NEW YORK TIMES

28 May 1969

## Technology Is Scored By Soviet Physicist

By THEODORE SHACAD  
Special to The New York Times

MOSCOW, May 27—Pyotr L. Kapitsa, a noted Soviet physicist, has declared that Soviet ideologists are lagging behind the times and has criticized them for not competing openly with other world philosophies.

The 75-year-old scientist, known here for his liberal opinions, said that in political, economic and cultural fields the Soviet Union was on almost par with the United States and other developed countries, but in the "battle of the century" Soviet ideology was virtually without influence in the outside world.

Dr. Kapitsa said that revolutionary movements in the west, which he said by students, had made the ground fertile for new ideas, but that Soviet ideologists "are isolated from this revolutionary movement and practically have no influence." "It is necessary to actively join ideological battle," he said, "and in this fight our philosophers will have to be on equal terms, just as our sportsmen, when they compete."

### Fears Loss of Privileges

"Our ideologists will lose the privileges they have in our country where there are no competing views," he said. "In the future fight no one will have an advantage, and everything will take place on an equal basis."

Dr. Kapitsa, Russian-born, studied nuclear physics in England from 1921 to 1934 under Lord Rutherford and despite his closeness with Stalin after his return to the Soviet Union, he remained a loyal Communist and had a role in the development of Soviet nuclear weaponry.

He is, however, a frequent critic of the dogmatism and methodical thinking in both science and the humanities.

His views on the need for Soviet ideology to emerge from its isolation are believed to be shared by many Soviet liberals, who think ideology in the Soviet Union is too defensive, and to often reacts negatively to Western ideas without providing an alternative.

Dr. Kapitsa spoke at the end of February at a special meeting of the presidium of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, which was called to discuss the need for broadening the scope of the academy's philosophy.

Dr. Kapitsa's first wife and child died in a famine in 1919 while he was a lecturer at the Polytechnic Institute of Petrograd, now Leningrad.

In England, he was married in 1926 to Anna Krylova, the daughter of an émigré. One of their two children, Andrei, is a glaciologist and head of the School of Geography at Moscow University.